Chapter 6

Inventing Solutions

> *"…the people who work government are not the problem; the systems in which they work are the problem."*
>
> *"The employees know the system best and they know where the problems lurk. Even if a manager can diagnose the problem, without employee buy-in it is difficult to solve."*
>
> *Osborne and Gaebler, Reinventing Government.*

As seen in the previous two chapters, the analytical and energizing phases of the Investor Roadmap do not produce procedural change. While this analysis is systematic and thorough, and makes a compelling argument for change, it is basically an assemblage of facts. Arguably, if the Roadmap process was to cease after the validation exercise, the final report would presumably become one more of those consultant "document drops" that would sit on the proverbial shelf gathering dust.

The real challenge, therefore, is to translate that assemblage of data into measurable change. Here is clearly the real strength of the Roadmap: the Roadmap's ability to channel this enthusiasm and motivation into an organized and cooperative process which in turn leads to the development of effective solutions. The means by which this motivation is channeled into effective change is the "process improvement workshop." While the analytical report may attract the most attention due to its stark and visual demonstration of bureaucratic complexity, the process improvement workshop is the real core of the Roadmap's ability to achieve change. It is this capability that excites many development practitioners, for it signifies a new approach to creating effective institutional and procedural change in the public sector.

This chapter reviews the process management workshop, the key elements of the workshop, the importance of government ownership, and the role of the facilitator.

The Roadmap approach uses a number of tools to help change or improve those processes selected as most problematic. The most common tool is the use of “process improvement workshops.” *(Possible other tools to implement procedural changes, such as electronic governance and customer service mechanisms, are discussed in Chapter 8 and 9.).* These workshops utilize various types of professional facilitation techniques and concepts. These reflect the facilitation techniques developed internally by a number of U.S. corporations and leading accounting firms, and are chiefly derived from management communications and organizational behavior approaches. The focus of these workshops is to capitalize on the momentum created by the Roadmap analysis in motivating and energizing key officials by enabling them to *invent* solutions that can then be implemented. The means by which this occurs, and the techniques employed, are discussed below.

Designing the Process Improvement Workshop

Identifying the procedural focus

The Roadmap analytical report surveys and documents 13 separate processes. In most developing countries, the majority of these processes will be problematical to some degree or another for a potential investor. Clearly, however, not all these obstacles are equally problematical, nor is it feasible to attempt to address all these problems simultaneously. How then, is it determined which processes to focus on first?

Typically, two to four processes are selected by the Roadmap Team as the focus of the process workshops. Several criteria guide this selection process: processes are chosen that are characterized by substantial procedural problems (e.g., the process is slow, inefficient, or applications are frequently lost); processes for which the customer interface is poor (e.g., interaction between the agents and customer is complicated or characterized by poor service); and processes for which the lead agency wants to change. The last criterion is critical for it will affect the ultimate success of any effort to change the procedure.

In most countries, it is readily apparent by the end of the Roadmap presentations and validation process, which of the 13 processes are most problematic. These processes will be those which have been repeatedly identified by investors and others as posing considerable hurdles. In some cases, procedures which are identified as particularly difficult will not be selected if the surrounding circumstances are in flux; for example, if the law or policies governing the procedure are in the process of being changed by the government, or addressed in another fashion.

Two other factors are also incorporated into the selection process. These are the need to achieve a "quick victory", as discussed in the previous chapter, and of course, resource availability. If too many procedural changes are attempted at the same time, staff resources -- including both government staff and Roadmap facilitators -- will be stretched too thin and the momentum for change will be dissipated. In addition, there are strategic advantages in limiting the number of processes that will be addressed. If procedural changes are attempted on a pilot basis, limited to one or two procedures, it is possible to judge just what type of changes or reforms are actually feasible in the current environment. Moreover, pilot changes enable the change process to benefit from the learning curve, so that any needed adjustments are made early and on a small scale.

The relative weight given to each of these considerations will vary from country to country, and there is no uniform formula that can be provided that will show how to select those procedures that most suitable for change management. *(Box 6.1 illustrates how this winnowing process was achieved in Tanzania.)* The most common workshop topics to date have been customs (Namibia, Tanzania); immigration (Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania), and tourism (the Dominican Republic, Kenya, Zambia).

The advantages of cross-cutting institutional teams

While the workshops have a common procedural focus, the workshop participants may come from several different departments within a single agency (for example, …) or from several different agencies, for those procedures which are cross institutional in nature (for example, …).

Box 6.1: Selecting Processes for the Workshops

In Tanzania, for example, six processes were identified as candidates for further action: import customs clearance; business/trade license issuance; issuance of expatriate permits; investor immigration permits; land acquisition; and planning approvals. While procedures in other areas also posed problems to investors, these six were identified as particularly complicated and time-consuming. Moreover, it was felt that these problem areas could be effectively addressed through procedural reforms, which are relatively simpler to implement, as opposed to legislative or policy reforms, which are more difficult to implement. Most importantly, however, the agencies responsible for these procedures were judged to be the interested/receptive to adopting change management programs.

· Upon consultation with USAID, this list was winnowed down to three: expatriate work permits, investor visas, and import customs clearance. This final selection was based on those areas procedures that presented the greatest complexity to investors, but which also appeared to be ripe for change and have the greatest potential for success in the short-term. This "bang-for-the-buck" aspect is an important one, as the participants – the Roadmap Team, the donor agency, and the government – have a united interest in generating the maximum impact from the exercise.

In both cases, these individual departments or agencies may have no idea what happens to a particular document or application once it passes out of their control. This is the institutional equivalent of "throwing it over the wall;" that is, the document is passed out of sight and out of view.

Holding a workshop on a cross-departmental or cross-agency basis has several advantages when it comes to brainstorming and problem solving. Teamwork organizations have a greater ability to innovate and to accomplish tasks. In addition, this focus has additional strengths:[1]

- Cross-departmental teams bring different viewpoints, based on their location within the process. While each individual department will only see their aspect of the problem, a team can view the entire procedure and identify all its problems.

- When brought face-to-face with these different perspectives, participants begin to think "'outside the box'" of their own department or agency.

- By thinking across typical bureaucratic turf wall, cross-departmental teams foster collaboration. As a result, procedures no longer fit neatly within departmental or agency lines, and the proposed solutions reflect this collaboration.

- The use of teams can also help to build networks as participants get to know like-minded individuals in other departments and agencies. These networks enable ideas and information to flow more easily, which will facilitate future cross-departmental actions.

- Finally, cross-departmental teams hold employees to higher standards, which can serve as a more effective quality control mechanism than control exerted from the top in typical bureaucratic fashion.

Managing the Process Improvement Workshop

Process improvement workshops are a highly intensive, interactive, and hands-on process that takes place over 2-3 days. Much of the preparation is akin to preparing for a conference: organizing logistical details such as selecting an appropriate location and room, preparing an invitation list, mailing invitations, arranging the luncheons, and the like.

The most important aspect of this preparation, however, is identifying appropriate participants. Ideally, only 12-15 participants are selected, so it is important to pull together officials who are organizationally astute, highly motivated, and who are capable of actively and intelligently designing solutions to these procedural dilemmas.

The core of the workshop is the participation by "front line" mid-level personnel who are actively involved in the process in question. A typical example would the Immigration Officer who actually reviews the application for an expatriate work permit, and who would be the investor's point of contact should the application be deemed faulty. The participating agencies select participants who are not too high level, who are actively involved, are intimately involved in the procedures, and who are dynamic and energetic. Typically, those selected are the "best and the brightest" and are enthusiastic and interested in actively participating in the change management process. During the workshops, the responsibility and effort for inventing solutions rests almost entirely with the agency participants, so if they are lacking in sufficient commitment, the workshop process will be effectively useless.

Like most successful events, workshops are carefully managed in order to maximize their effectiveness and impact. This management is critical to maximizing the impact of the workshops and tightening their focus onto solutions that realistic and feasible.

This orchestration is evident throughout the workshop phase. For example, press releases may be prepared and released to maximize public and agency awareness of the workshops. Similarly, while invitations from senior government officials may be mailed to workshop participants, they mailed only after the participant has already agreed to attend, thereby ensuring that the participant's attendance is motivated by a real desire to participate in a meaningful fashion, rather than as a result of a ministerial directive.

Similarly, the parameters of potential change are managed. On the first day of the workshop, senior officials (typically at the Director or Permanent Secretary level) of each participating agency are brought into the workshop. Their role is to present the goals and objectives of the workshop to their participating staff. Prior to this presentation, these goals and objectives have typically been worked out and reviewed with the Roadmap consultants to ensure that they are achievable and reachable. This presentation gives participants guidelines as to what types of solutions are feasible and allowable; for example, participants may be told that purchasing more computers is not an acceptable approach because existing resources do not permit it. More importantly, this presentation represents a symbolic transfer of ownership from management to the technocrats.

These goals are written on large charts where they hang for the next three days. These guidelines are used to structure the ensuing discussions, and to ensure that the solutions reached by the workshop are both politically and logistically feasible.

On the final day of the workshop, the roles of the technocrats and senior officials are reversed as workshop participants present their findings. This too is carefully orchestrated, as the workshop facilitators have used the workshop sessions to identify the most authoritative speakers. The consultants also provide technical support such as coaching in presentational skills and assisting in preparing slides.

The process workshops are a significant tool in building government ownership of the process. In fact, the entire process is designed to transfer ownership to the government. From the standpoint of *efficiency*, it would be more effective to do without the process workshops: conceivably, three people could do in three hours what fifteen people take three days of process workshops to complete. From the standpoint of *results*, however, this approach would not be as effective because the solutions would not belong to the government. The process workshops, therefore, are an important tool that maximizes the probability that these solutions will be implemented.

Inside the Process Workshop: What Happens?

Once the workshop commences, three key events take place: *process mapping, problem identification*, and *development of an action plan*. These sequential events incorporate a variety of interactive techniques to encourage participation and problem solving by all participants. Each of these three phases will be discussed in turn.

Process mapping

Process mapping simply entails the identification – by the participants – of all the relevant steps that an investor must undertake in order to complete the process in question. This phase draws upon the responsibilities and knowledge of all participants. Collectively, the workshop participants can scope out the process in its entirety, even though individually they may be familiar with only their own specific part.

Almost universally, these workshops are not led by experts in the specific area that is the focus of the workshop (e.g., customs or immigration. Rather, they are led by the Roadmap consultant who serves as a facilitator. While the facilitators are typically knowledgeable about essential procedures, and are usually well versed in the "best practices" found in other countries, they are not experts by any means. Expertise exists within the room already, however, in the form of the workshop participants. What the consultant provides is facilitation skills. In combination, these skills and expertise create an effective partnership for problem solving.

Re-creation of the process in detail may take an entire day and the group dynamics of this phase can become quite intense: as one consultant in the Dominican Republic observed afterwards "I never saw anybody get so excited about land titles before." [ck quote] The end result is a starkly visual "map" on the wall that representation that delineates the multiple points of interaction between the investor and various government agencies. It also shows where documents are forwarded from one agency to another and then back to the initial agency as multiple approvals are collected.

Process mapping is an essential element in the development of solutions, because it visually re-creates the process. For many participants, this is the first time that they have seen the process as a wholly integrated and sequential series of tasks. By combining this series of fragmented

processes into a single entity, participants are immediately able to perceive the process' complexity in terms of the time needed to complete it, the number of steps that must be completed, and potential redundancy of many steps. Process mapping in itself frequently contributes to the development of solutions *(see Box 6.2).*

Problem identification

Completion of the process mapping sets the stage for the problem identification phase. First, the participants create a laundry list of problems with the process. This is a common facilitating tool used in problem identification and in generating solutions. The purpose is to encourage workshop members to shout out ideas and participate activity in the process; prioritization of problems is a lesser focus at this stage.

The process map is subdivided into discrete and logical sub-sets of activities. For example, import customs clearance can be divided into (1) those activities needed to complete all the paperwork needed for preshipment; (2) those steps taken while the goods are at sea; and (3) those steps that are taken when the goods arrive in port. In this phase, the participants have to take full ownership of the analysis as they compile a laundry list of what goes wrong in each sub-set of activity.

The focus here is not only determining what the government does wrong, but also *what the investor does wrong*. Frequently, the investor's "wrongs" (or distortionary behavior in economic terms) result from perverse or illogical government rules. As illustrated in the Tanzanian case presented in Box 6.3, while the investor's actions may not be justifiable (and may be distinctly illegal) identification of these actions can help to indicate precisely which government rules need to be changed, and what the possible solutions might be.

Once the problems are identified, participants each "vote" for the three problems that are considered to be the most significant. This voting almost invariably leads to the identification of five or six problems that are at the top of nearly everyone's priority list. The only criteria guiding this selection is that they have to be problems that are within the capability of the participants to resolve; for example, they cannot be problems that require legal solutions if there are no lawyers in the room. Likewise, they must be "significant and solvable;" that is, important problems that occur frequently, rather than exceptional cases.

Almost universally, this selection process yields a handful of problems that all participants feel to be the most important. The group then breaks down into smaller groups to identify possible solutions to the problems, which are then presented to the group as a whole. This phase is by necessity a flexible one, and the facilitators will use a variety of creative techniques to help the process along *(see Box 6.4 on the use of problem-solving techniques)*. As needed, the group may vote on these solutions, and may break down again into smaller groups for further brainstorming.

Development of the Action Plan

The final part of the workshop is the development of an action plan for change management. This plan identifies what is to be done, what can be done immediately, who needs to approve it and other step-by-step actions that are required to implement the solutions. Here, the consultant's job is to bring the identified solutions into a series of tight conclusions. The

Box 6.2: Process Mapping Leads to Procedural Changes

Process workshops have been successful in identifying concrete and measurable reforms in the investment processes in Tanzania and Malawi. These reforms resulted from the process mapping, which enabled participants to see the process in its entirety, whereas previously each individual saw only his individual action. Consequently, this mapping process enable participants to identify those instances where time that was unnecessarily spent.

Tanzania

When the Tanzanian customs process workshop completed the process mapping, there was a complete picture on the wall of all the agencies and steps involved in customs clearance. For the first time, the participants had a "holistic sense" of what they do and how all their separate activities were linked together. What immediately was apparent to all was that an importer had to undergo a number of actions with each of the agencies involved in customs clearance. No single agency required too many interactions, but in combination they added up to 14 (?) separate interactions which was a considerable number.

The workshop participants identified a number of problems with the customs clearance process, and formed the following solutions to two of these problems.

The Problem: A number of agencies were physically located far apart, and the traffic in sections of downtown Dar es Salaam was so congested, that the investor spent a lot of time simply coming and going and searching for parking.

The Solution: It was decided that all customs clearance procedures should be moved to the new customs "Long Room," which at the time was under construction. This approach did not affect the procedures themselves, but by centralizing the procedures in a single location, the amount of time spent by the importer on compliance would be dramatically reduced.

The Problem: If customs needed to inspect incoming goods, it would notify the importer and the importer would be responsible for notifying the Harbour Authority to move the container to the inspection point. This requirement added two more interactions on top of the 14 that an importer already had to undergo to get goods cleared through customs.

The Solution: Participants decided that the Harbour Authority and Customs should be given the authority to move the container in question, and to call in the importer at the time of inspection. This solution reduced the number of potential interactions for the importer, but had the additional benefit of enabling the Harbour Authority to better lay out containers within the port, thereby reducing the logistical problems associated with off loading containers.

Malawi

The Problem: By mapping the work permit process, workshop participants recognized that the secretary had to type letters on five different occasions for internal use. It frequently took 1-2 weeks to get a letter type because of the backlog of letters. When participants saw these steps laid out in a holistic fashion, it became clear that the secretary was not adding any value to the communication, and this step was actually slowing the process down.

The Solution: It was decided that standardized forms, rather than letters, could be used for internal communication. Moreover, while "internal communication" had previously meant within the Ministry of Labor and Immigration Department, the workshop decided to change this definition so that all communication within the government was internal. Accordingly, forms could be used for all internal communication within the government rather than formal letters.

Box 6.3: Problem Identification as a Tool for Identifying Solutions

Tanzanian Pre-shipment Procedures and Import Customs Clearance

The value of the problem identification process in identifying feasible solutions is demonstrated in the workshop focusing on Tanzanian pre-shipment and import customs clearance procedures. At the time that change management workshops were taking place in Tanzania in 1997, Tanzanian customs rules stated that all imports valued at less than US$400 were not subject to pre-shipment inspection rules. The pre-shipment inspection requirement was introduced several years prior to reduce smuggling (?)/combat corruption, and increase government customs revenues. Pre-shipment inspection essentially "privatizes" the valuation process. These inspections would take place in the country of origin for the imports, and would be conducted by the independent Swiss company Societe Generale de Surveillance (SGS). The charge for this inspection was 1.5 percent (??) of the value of the consignment.

The unintended impact of this rule was to encourage importers to substantially understate the value of their imports so to avoid the inspection process and payment of the pre-shipment inspection charge. When the importer would go to the "Long Room," where customs clearance would take place, a customs agent would point out that it was inconceivable that such an item could be worth less than $400.

At this point, valuation of the goods for customs duty purposes would be necessary. Under SGS rules, however, the local SGS office was not allowed to value the imports; the only acceptable valuation was that performed by the pre-shipment office at the point of origin -- that is, in Singapore, or London, or wherever the goods imported from. Moreover, while the local SGS office could use an electronic transmission such as fax or e-mail to forward the relevant details to that overseas office, the subsequent valuation would not be acceptable as an official document if it was returned by electronic means. As a result, not only did the valuation have to be completed in the country of origin, a "hard" copy had to sent by courier to Customs officials in Tanzania, resulting in additional delays. In the interim, the item in question would sit in the long room, occupying valuable space.

The responsibility for this problem ultimately lay with the importer's illegal behavior in under-valuing the goods. Nonetheless, this impact of this behavior – the piles of goods in the Long Room -- was compounded by the nature of the existing procedures; principally, the inability of the SGS to locally value the imports; the inability of the importer to leave a deposit and take the goods; and the prohibition on the use of an electronically transmitted valuation as an official document. Once the problem identification process identified who was at fault and why, workshop participants were able to come up with a number of potential solutions, including allowing local inspections to occur, assessing exorbitant fees on goods awaiting valuation, and the like. Ultimately, several solutions were adopted to this problem, including an increase in the minimum value to $2000, the introduction of electronic commerce legislation, and a commitment by the government to ensure that its next contract with SGS included the capability for the local valuation of goods.

Kenya: .. (get from Roxy)

Dominican Republic:

workshop ends with the return of senior management and the participants' presentation of the action plan and demonstrating how the goals and objectives have been met.

The Importance of Ownership

As previously discussed, government ownership of the Roadmap findings and solutions is a critical component of the Roadmap, and it is a key characteristic that sets the Roadmap apart from other consultant-led attempts at change. In order to be effective, solutions must be developed by the workshop participants; without ownership, the agencies involved are unlikely to implement the solutions, no matter how logical. If agency officials design solutions, however, the dynamics of their direct involvement in the process gives them an enthusiasm and motivation to implement those changes, and they are more likely to translate into effective and sustainable reform. This phenomenon is not confined to the Roadmap, but has been widely demonstrated in similar exercises in state and municipal governments, large corporations, and community-based organizations.

The motivational power of ownership has been repeatedly demonstrated in the Roadmap exercises, both in generating general support for the Roadmap exercise and within the

Box 6.4: Bricks, Blocks, Tape, Newspapers, and String: Conceptual Building Blocks for Inventing Change

The problem-solving techniques used to encourage the development of solutions can vary substantially from country to country depending on the characteristics of the processes addressed by the workshop. In Malawi, participants in the workshops focusing on land and immigration issues were given piles of bricks, blocks, newspapers, magazines, string, and tape. Each room was divided into two teams, each of which received equal-sized piles of these materials. The objective of each team was to build a tower out of these assorted materials. Each tower would be judged in terms of three criteria: height, stability, and aesthetics.

The results of the exercise are instructive. One team almost completed a tower before discovering that the tape had not been used. The tower was then torn down and rebuilt, using the missing tape. Another group completed the tower without using the string. When asked why the string was excluded, it was explained that the string added nothing to the final result in terms of the three criteria – that is, it added neither height, nor stability, nor contributed to the tower's aesthetics.

Why was this exercise applicable to reforming immigration procedures? It was useful for the following reasons. One, it illustrated to the participants that just as one group felt compelled to use the string, governments similarly feel the need to include existing agencies and departments in a process simply because they are available, even if they do not logically contribute to the goals of that process. For example, if an institution has a cashier office, any needed cash collection will be done through that office, even if cash collection could more quickly or more logically be taken care of through a more centrally office.

Two, it illustrated how the work permit process could be improved. Once the immigration permit process was mapped out on the wall for all to see, participants were instructed to find the pieces of "string" that did not meet the goals of the process. That is, the exercise enabled the participants to conceptually visualize how the permitting process might be collapsed by eliminating those unnecessary steps that interfered with the agency's goal of a more expedited process.

Box 6.5: Sample Action Plan from …

(to be provided by MS)

workshops. During the initial stages of the Kenyan Roadmap, for example, the Roadmap team entered a meeting with the Director of Tourism. As described by a team member:

> You can tell by his expression and his body language that he was basically just being polite -- 'Ah yes, we have another group of consultants in my office.' And we started talking about the project and we start describing the change management workshops and how this is a facilitation exercise to get his staff to come up with the solutions and for them to buy into this and take ownership. And his eyes lit up, and he sort of leaned in and got very involved and really bought into the process.
>
> I think that this is a very good example of the type of reaction we tend to get and why this project is successful… [Its] simply based on the fact that the strength of this project is that they have a voice -- the government, the agencies, the individuals. They are not getting something shoved down their throat. They are not being criticized for not being good enough.

The concept of ownership has several components. Within the workshops, a sense of ownership of the *solutions* is clearly a critical aspect in developing solutions that are realistic, appropriate, and that can be effectively implemented. Equally important, however, is creating a sense of ownership of the change management *process*. Ultimately, if government officials believe that they own and can duplicate the change management process and apply it to other areas, they have learned the power of achieving sustainable change.

To the extent that this capacity can be developed in government officials, as opposed to being stimulated by outside donors or consultants, true institutional strengthening will result. Teaching government officials the techniques of how to approach and modify the process is the ultimate goal of the Roadmap because it creates a self-sustaining mechanism for change. [gregg] Developing this "adaptive capacity" is a key element in re-inventing bureaucracies, because it enables institutions to address new issues as they arise, and to adapt to changing conditions. This capability not only improves current effectiveness, but also ensures that institutions can continue to remain effective in the future.[2]

Developing a sense of ownership can also be a critical step towards reducing corruption. While corruption is a multi-faceted problem, it is in large part the result of a procedurally complex process. In this sense, it is the nature of the process, both in terms of the number of steps involved and the lack of transparency that engenders or enables corruption to occur. In one East African country for example, the documentation process to clear goods through customs went through 16 different hands to get stamped. "Basically, it's like a tollbooth, and every time you stop at the tollbooth it's an opportunity for corruption." The opportunities for such behavior are linked to the number of steps involved; "if you limit the number of tolls, you limit the number of opportunities," as well as accelerating the speed with which the process can be completed by the investor.

Corruption is also indirectly addressed through the process of ownership. Roadmap team members have frequently found that corruption is not simply a compensation-related problem, a reaction to inadequate salaries:

> The motivation to be corrupt -- its much more human than that. We found that in these change management workshops…when you put these people in the room and give them a voice which they have never had an opportunity to express, oftentimes…[you see] a man in this process, and you know that this is a very corrupt man but you give him ownership in changing [that process] and he actually makes it very difficult for himself to be corrupt. The motivation of the ownership is greater than the desire for a bribe. I think that every human being wants to feel that they are part of something, that they are doing something, making a difference.

Role of the Roadmap Facilitator

The Roadmap consultant(s) serve as facilitator throughout this stage, but to be effective, this role has to be a subtle one. While the consultants are intensively involved in the first stage of the Roadmap, and take the lead in the presentation of the Roadmap's findings, this role shifts perceptibly in the solution identification stage. During the workshops, the consultant's acts as facilitator, planting ideas if necessary, but more appropriately focusing on encouraging the development of solutions by the participants themselves.

The basic premise behind this progression in the consultant's role is that "at the end of the day" government ownership of any solutions is paramount. In the words of one consultant:

> "Initially, our involvement is heavy – it's the data collection, the analysis, the writing – but as we progress, step-by-step ideally what should happen is that our role should become smaller and smaller and the [sponsoring agency's] role should become larger and larger. We ideally want to fade out into the background and remain as facilitators. We start this with the validation process, but it really starts with the change management workshops."

When properly implemented, the facilitator's role is to help the host country professionals to work together to devise concrete and practical ways to address constraints, rather than to suggest specific solutions. In the words of one Roadmap team member: "We tell [workshop participants] that 'We are not here to tell you how to do your job, we will never be as expert at what you do as you are.'" What the facilitator does do, however, is to help channel that expertise into the development of feasible and realistic solutions. As needed, the facilitator may have to use some creative techniques to make participants conceptually understand why change is necessary, and how it can be achieved.

The facilitator also directs the workshop discussion in a manner that is most likely to result in implementable solutions. During the process mapping stage, for example, a key role of the facilitator is to shape the level of detail that is included in the map. This may vary from country to country, depending on the process involved and the types of obstacles that need to be addressed. In some countries too much emphasis on the individual steps in a process may cause the participants to lose sight of the process in its entirety. In other countries, however, this level of detail may be necessary in order to make clear to the participants exactly how delays occur.

For example, in a tremendously complicated system such as that which existed in Tanzania in 1996, the focus of the exercise by necessity had to be on eliminating entire steps. In this case, focusing on minute detail would have been counterproductive. In countries such as Malawi, where delays resulted primarily from small things such as giving a letter to the secretary for typing focusing on details enables workshop participants to identify where the process could be expedited *(refer to Box 6.2)*. This then, is the role of the facilitator, therefore, is to identify what the general outcome of the process should be, and to gently steer the workshop in that direction.

Final Outcome

The outcome of the "inventing" phase is the development or identification of solutions to difficult procedural problems. The action plan that results – which is also called a “pilot change management program” – sets the stage for the next, and most important, part of the Roadmap: implementation of the identified changes.

End-Notes

[1] Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler. Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit s Transforming the Public Sector. New York: Penguin Books, 1982. pp.270-71.
[2] Banishing Bureaucracy, p. 14.